

Hope College

Hope College Digital Commons

Van Raalte Papers: 1850-1859

Van Raalte Papers

7-8-1858

Letter from A. C. Van Raalte to Mr. Samuel Pruijn

A. C. Van Raalte

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.hope.edu/vrp_1850s

The original documents are held in the Holland Museum. This digitized material is intended for personal research/study only. The original documents may not be reproduced for commercial use in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, without permission in writing from the [Holland Museum](#).

Recommended Citation

Van Raalte, A. C., "Letter from A. C. Van Raalte to Mr. Samuel Pruijn" (1858). *Van Raalte Papers: 1850-1859*. 51.

https://digitalcommons.hope.edu/vrp_1850s/51

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Van Raalte Papers at Hope College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Van Raalte Papers: 1850-1859 by an authorized administrator of Hope College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@hope.edu.

Julij 8, 1858

Holland Ott: Mich

A letter to Mr. Samuel Pruijn, Esquire, Albany, New York from the Rev. Albertus C. Van Raalte, borne by John Roost who is out East raising money for the Holland Harbor.

Van Raalte had stayed at the Pruijn home when in Albany. He recommends through Roost that "Christian friends" in the East purchase \$100 bonds to help raise the needed funds.

Original in the Holland Historical Trust Collection of the Joint Archives of Holland, T88-230.

Holland Ott. Mich. -
July 8. 1858. -

Sam^l Pruyn Esq,

Dear Friend. -

The remembrance
of your kindness and my refreshing stay
in the midst of your kind family, always
causing yet a sweet emotion, encourages
me to introduce to you the Bearer
Mr. J. Roost Supervisor of our Town: and pray
you in behalf of the welfare of our Colony
to give him your sympathy counsel and
aid so far as possible. -

You know the importance of our Harbor
Question, entirely neglected by the Govern-
ment: this interest made it our Super-
visor imperative, to try to sell few hun-
dreds of Dollars of Town Bonds, all authorized
by legislative act; - It is the saving of the
Colony: Few of the citizens are bound by
Contract to build an efficient beginning
of two ditch pieces of 200 feet each for

by Mr. Roost
Sam^l Pruyn Esq

\$5000. They being convinced that
it must be built to save the people
and to give the poor during the
pressure of the times work and bread.

This caused the urgent necessity for
our Supervisor to go out to seek few
Christian Friends Who are willing
~~to~~ to take a hundred Dollars bond.

I pray therefore my dear Friend if possible
help him in this great object: - if we
were not in such a narrow corner I would
not trouble you: but now I beseech you
do what you can and the God of all
grace give our Colony grace in the
eyes of your Christian Friends.

Receive my dear Friend with Mrs. Brown,
your tender love to kind lady, and your
Sisters and dear Children my best wishes
and all kindness and sympathy shown
to Mr. Root a helpless stranger will be
thankfully acknowledged by your truly
much obliged Brother
H. Van Hook

letter

July 8, 1858

To: Sam Pruijn

Holland, MI

From: A.C. Van Raalte

Taken by J. Roost.

This letter explains the government's inability to help, other than allowing Holland to create Harbor Bonds. VR is asking for assistance in people out East buying the bonds, not just giving up money.

Talks about the piers which were being constructed at 200 ft. for \$5,000 by citizens.

"You know the importance of our Harbor question, entirely neglected by the Government; this is in . . ."

John Roost - supervisor of the Town of Holland at the time. On trip out east to find buyers.

A.C. VR.

timely issue of abortion. With traditional ethics you have no rational means to determine which side of the issue is right. Clearly you can't question the motives or the morality of either side. I don't question the motives, for instance, of Dr. Pinnock, and I'm sure he doesn't question mine. For example, if I give you a list of "rights" which have been claimed by both proponents and opponents of this issue, let's see how we can determine rationally within traditional ethics which is right. We have the right of society to protect the right of the unborn to live. But then you have the mother who says, "I have a right over my own body." Then you have the parents who say, "We have a right to dictate our own future." Then you have the right of society to say, "We have the right to protect the unborn not to be born," or "We have the right to protect the unborn not to be born uncared for," or "We have the right to protect the unborn not to be born abnormal." I am pretty confident that you would not be able to come up with the criteria to determine which right is "right." Only force, coercion and emotion have been traditionally used to establish which right takes precedence. In New York they voted that it is legal (hence, right) to have an abortion. In Michigan we have claimed it to be illegal (hence, immoral). The implication of that (legislating morality) is much too profound to be covered in the original debate topic tonight.